



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/552,882	10/13/2005	Seugdong Lee	39090-77	9191

87133 7590 05/26/2010  
Dickinson Wright, PLLC  
1875 Eye Street, NW  
Suite 1200  
Washington, DC 20006

EXAMINER
----------

KAO, JUTAI

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2473

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

05/26/2010

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

kspivak@dickinsonwright.com  
awilson@dickinsonwright.com  
cvphillips@dickinsonwright.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/552,882	<b>Applicant(s)</b> LEE ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> JUTAI KAO	<b>Art Unit</b> 2473	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 February 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 8-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 8-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                    | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

Amendments filed on 02/25/2010 overcome the claim objection presented in the previous action. The corresponding claim objection is withdrawn.

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed 02/25/2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
2. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Regarding claims 8 and 14, the applicant first argues that Rom and Kesavan do not disclose that the packet traffic volume in a switch is controlled by a switching processor "in response to an input traffic command" wherein "said input traffic control command" is output by a controller for registering traffic volume. However, Rom discloses a switching processor that keeps track of the number of packets for each port that reacts to control command to inhibit transmission, such as a received PAUSE frame (see previous rejection). Kesavan, on the other hand, teaches a controller that issues commands such as dropping packets or allowing packets to pass to each port (see paragraph [0032]). That is, Kesavan teaches the issuing of commands to a

Art Unit: 2473

switching processor while Rome teaches a switching processor that reacts to the received command.

The applicant then argues that "no disclosure can be found in Rom that such a "frame" or command is output as a result of a comparison of a user value and a value in a packet register" (see page 6 of the applicant's response). However, previous rejection relies on Kesavan for rejecting this feature, therefore this argument is moot.

The applicant then argues that "Although Kesavan does disclose that certain data packets in a network are dropped or forwarded at a switch depending on a certain threshold, Kesavan does not disclose that a control command is actually output to a switching processor if a threshold is exceeded. However, since Kesavan discloses the issuing of commands to drop or forward the packet, when combined with the switching processor of Rom that controls the forwarding of packet, such command must be forwarded to Rom's switching controller when viewing the combined invention as a whole. In addition, Fig. 1 of Kesavan discloses a storm control device 110, which is responsible for determining whether to drop or forward packets depending on the threshold, and a forwarding device 112, which is responsible for forwarding the packets. It is clear that commands on whether to forward or drop the packets is sent from the storm control device 110 to the forwarding device 112.

The applicant then argues that Kesavan does not disclose the registration of "traffic volume for each of said plurality of ports," meaning that the data volume for each port of a switch is monitored and registered. However, as described in the claimed language, the "traffic volume, is a user value that is compared against the packet

Art Unit: 2473

counter register, instead of a value that is being monitored. Furthermore, Kesavan does disclose such monitoring of traffic against a user value, as shown in paragraph [0029], which states "When the number of designated packets either received or, alternatively, transmitted by a particular port 106, 107 or 108 reaches the configured threshold value in the configured time interval, respectively, the storm control device 110 may drop the designated packets..."

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 8-10, 12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rom (US 6,252,849) in view of Kesavan (US 2004/0062200).

Rom discloses a flow control mechanism using output port buffer allocation including the following features.

Regarding claim 8, an apparatus (see apparatus 201 shown in Fig. 2 and apparatus 301 in Fig. 3) for controlling traffic over a network (see network shown in Fig. 1), comprising: a switching processor, including a plurality of ports connectable to a network line (see plurality of output ports and input ports in Fig. 2 and Fig. 3) and packet counter registers for storing counting information on packets (see counter 1-N in Fig. 3) ingressed and egressed (see “Counter 2 is incremented in response to an information packet received from input port 2 being admitted into buffer 305. Counter 2 is decremented in response to an information packet received from input port 2 and held in buffer 305, being transmitted from output port 301” recited in column 4, lines 60-65) and for controlling ingress and egress packet traffic volume for each of said plurality of ports in response to an input traffic control command (see “A PAUSE frame is provided to an information packet source by a downstream destination to inhibit transmission of information packets such as information frames by the information packet source to the downstream destination for a specified period of time” recited in column 5, lines 8-12).

Regarding claim 10, an apparatus (see apparatus 201 shown in Fig. 2 and apparatus 301 in Fig. 3) for controlling traffic over a network (see network shown in Fig. 1), comprising: a switching processor, including a plurality of ports connectable to a network line (see plurality of output ports and input ports in Fig. 2 and Fig. 3) and packet counter registers for storing counting information on packets (see counter 1-N in Fig. 3) ingressed and/or egressed (see “Counter 2 is incremented in response to an

Art Unit: 2473

information packet received from input port 2 being admitted into buffer 305. Counter 2 is decremented in response to an information packet received from input port 2 and held in buffer 305, being transmitted from output port 301" recited in column 4, lines 60-65) and for controlling ingress and/or egress packet traffic volume for said plurality of ports in response to an input traffic control command (see "A PAUSE frame is provided to an information packet source by a downstream destination to inhibit transmission of information packets such as information frames by the information packet source to the downstream destination for a specified period of time" recited in column 5, lines 8-12).

Regarding claims 9 and 12, wherein said input traffic control command is a control command that enables said packets ingressed or egressed through said port to be queued, dropped or paused (see "PAUSE" command recited in column 5, lines 8-12).

Regarding claim 14, a method for controlling a traffic volume ingressed or egressed via a port or a plurality of ports of a switching processor (see apparatus 201 in Fig. 2 and apparatus 301 in Fig. 3), comprising the steps of comparing a user value with a respective value of said traffic volume (see "When the level of occupancy of a portion of the buffer allocated to an input port exceeds a first level or threshold, the switch provides a control signal to the upstream sources operably coupled to the input port to inhibit information packet transmissions to the input port" recited in column 5, lines 45-50; where the user value is the first threshold and the respective value is the level of occupancy of the buffer), said respective value being written in a packet counter register (see Counters 1-N in Fig. 3), and issuing a traffic control command to said switching

Art Unit: 2473

processor (see "When the level of occupancy of a portion of the buffer allocated to an input port exceeds a first level or threshold, the switch provides a control signal to the upstream sources operably coupled to the input port to inhibit information packet transmissions to the input port" recited in column 5, lines 45-50); regarding claim 14, entering a user value, by a user through a data input unit, for a maximum traffic volume.

Rom does not disclose the following features: regarding claims 8 and 10, a controller for registering traffic volume for each of said plurality of ports in an internal register, said traffic volume being entered by a user through a data input unit as a user value, and for comparing a user value for each of said plurality of ports with a value in a respective one of said packet counter registers for said each port so as to output said input traffic control command for said each port to said switching processor.

Kesavan discloses a packet storm control including the following features.

Regarding claims 8 and 10, a controller (see computing device 101 in Fig. 1 including the storm control device 110) for registering traffic volume (see "threshold value" may also be established for each of the particular ports" recited in paragraph [0031]) for each of said plurality of ports in an internal register (see memory 124 in Fig. 1, the threshold value must be stored somewhere in memory), said traffic volume being entered by a user through a data input unit as a user value (see "threshold value may be established by the user" recited in paragraph [0031]), and for comparing a user value for each of said plurality of ports with a value in a respective one of said packet counter registers for said each port so as to output said input traffic control command for said each port (see "If...the threshold was not exceeded...allow designated packets to pass



Art Unit: 2473

through without being dropped...If...threshold was exceeded...the may continue to drop all designated packets for the next time interval.." recited in paragraph [0032]; also see "When the number of designated packets either received or, alternatively, transmitted by a particular port 106, 107 or 108 reaches the configured threshold value in the configured time interval, respectively, the storm control device 110 may drop the designated packets..." recited in paragraph [0029]) to said switching processor (see Forwarding device 112 in Fig. 1).

Regarding claim 14, entering a user value, by a user through a data input unit, for a maximum traffic volume (see "threshold value may be established by the user or automatically input to the storm control device" recited in paragraph [0031]; in which the threshold established and input by the user must be entered using a data input device).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Rom using features, as taught by Kesavan, in order to prevent degradation network performance due to excessive packets (see Kesavan paragraph [0032]).

6. Claims 11, 13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rom Kesavan as applied to claims 10 and 14 above, and further in view of Wang (US 2004/0151184).

Rom and Kesavan disclose the claimed limitations as explained above.

Rom also discloses the following features.

Regarding claims 13, wherein said input traffic control command is a control command that enables said packets ingressed or egressed through said port to be queued, dropped or paused (see "PAUSE" command recited in column 5, lines 8-12).

Rom and Kesavan do not disclose the following features: regarding claim 11 and 15, wherein said ingress and/or egress traffic volume is controlled via a token bucket, which is shared between the ports of said plurality of ports.

Wang discloses a class-based rate control using multi-threshold leaky bucket including the following features.

Regarding claim 11 and 15, wherein said ingress and/or egress traffic volume is controlled via a token bucket, which is shared between the ports of said plurality of ports (see "each packet received from the network access device 108 removes token from a bucket input buffer 114..." recited in paragraph [0009]; that is, a token bucket is used to control the buffer representing the total traffic volume).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Rom and Kesavan using features, as taught by Wang, in order to control the data rate at the claimed apparatus.

7. Claims 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rom and Kesavan as applied to claims 14 above, and further in view of Rose (US 2004/0205228) and Raphaeli (US 2003/0103521).

Rom and Kesavan discloses the claimed limitations as explained above.

Art Unit: 2473

Rom and Kesavan do not disclose the following features, regarding claim 16, wherein a packet is dropped by setting the frame size parameter smaller than the minimum Ethernet frame size.

Rose discloses an apparatus for detecting tiny fragment attacks including the following features.

Regarding claim 16, wherein a packet is dropped by setting the frame size parameter smaller than the minimum Ethernet frame size (see “filter 100 will drop any frame it receives if...the calculated Length 1 is less than 16 bytes” recited in paragraph [0018], that is, Rose sets a frame size parameter of 16 bytes, and dropping packets contained in frames smaller than that size).

Raphaeli discloses a channel access method for powerline carrier based media access control protocol including the following features.

Regarding claim 16, wherein the minimum Ethernet frame size is 64 bytes (see “as small as 64 bytes (corresponding to the minimum Ethernet frame size)” recited in paragraph [0026], which shows that the 16 bytes parameter in Rose’s invention is smaller than the minimum Ethernet frame size, as required by the claim).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Rom and Kesavan using features, as taught by Rose and Raphaeli, in order to prevent tiny data fragment attack of the system.

Art Unit: 2473

8. Claims 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rom, Kesavan and Wang as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of Rose (US 2004/0205228) and Raphaeli (US 2003/0103521).

Rom, Kesavan and Wang discloses the claimed limitations as explained above.

Rom, Kesavan and Wang do not disclose the following features, regarding claim 17, wherein a packet is dropped by setting the frame size parameter smaller than the minimum Ethernet frame size.

Rose discloses an apparatus for detecting tiny fragment attacks including the following features.

Regarding claim 17, wherein a packet is dropped by setting the frame size parameter smaller than the minimum Ethernet frame size (see “filter 100 will drop any frame it receives if...the calculated Length 1 is less than 16 bytes” recited in paragraph [0018], that is, Rose sets a frame size parameter of 16 bytes, and dropping packets contained in frames smaller than that size).

Raphaeli discloses a channel access method for powerline carrier based media access control protocol including the following features.

Regarding claim 17, wherein the minimum Ethernet frame size is 64 bytes (see “as small as 64 bytes (corresponding to the minimum Ethernet frame size)” recited in paragraph [0026], which shows that the 16 bytes parameter in Rose’s invention is smaller than the minimum Ethernet frame size, as required by the claim).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Rom, Kesavan and Wang using features, as taught by Rose and Raphaeli, in order to prevent tiny data fragment attack of the system.

### ***Conclusion***

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JUTAI KAO whose telephone number is (571)272-9719. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday ~Friday 7:30 AM ~5:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kwang Yao can be reached on (571)272-3182. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2473

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Ju-Tai Kao

/Ju-Tai Kao/  
Acting Examiner of Art Unit 2473

/KWANG B. YAO/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2473